

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as informal. Corrected formal drawings have been filed herewith.

The Examiner has further objected to Figures 18 and 19 as incorrectly including reference No. 254. Amended replacement drawings are attached hereto and are included in the formal drawings filed herewith. Marked-up copies of original Figures 18 and 19 are also attached, with the deleted features indicated in red ink.

The Examiner has objected to the cross-noting paragraph of the specification as requiring updating to identify the issued parent of the present application. The specification has now been amended to identify the parent Patent No. 6,207,719.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-45 as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner asserts the term "recycled emulsion" used in claim 1 and the term "emulsion" used in claim 17 lack antecedent basis. The Examiner further suggests that the term "mixing mean" used in claim 3, should read "mixing means." The Examiner also states that the claims should be amended to make clear whether "an existing emulsion is incorporated into the [claimed] process."

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 17 of the present application have now been amended as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, claims 26, 35 and 43 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 27 has been amended to clarify the steps of the claim. Claims 32-34 have been amended and new claims 46-48 added to correct the inadvertent reference to claim 17 as a "method" claim. Claims 40 and 41 have been amended by adding parentheses for clarity of the

equations. No new subject matter has been added by these amendments. Accordingly, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-45 on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting, as not patentably distinct from the claims of applicant's prior U.S. Patent No. 6,207,719. A terminal disclaimer has been filed herewith, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c). Accordingly, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the drawings and each of the claims 1-48 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a conversation with applicant's representative would be useful in the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's representative at the number listed below.

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

Dated: November 12, 2004

By: 

Brian J. Lum, Reg. No. 54,282
401 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Phone: (312) 661-2121
Fax: (312) 661-0029

Atty Reference: 202778-0033

[illegible]



ANNOTATED MARKED-UP DRAWINGS




FIG. 19